

**Original citation:**

Schilling, A., Kumar, A., McQuaid, R. G. P., Glazer, A. M., Thomas, Pam A. and Gregg, J. M.. (2016) Reconsidering the origins of Forsbergh birefringence patterns. Physical Review B (Condensed Matter and Materials Physics), 94 . 024109.

**Permanent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/80458>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

© 2016 American Physical Society

Published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.94.024109>

**A note on versions:**

The version presented in WRAP is the published version or, version of record, and may be cited as it appears here.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)

## Reconsidering the origins of Forsbergh birefringence patterns

A. Schilling,<sup>1</sup> A. Kumar,<sup>1</sup> R. G. P. McQuaid,<sup>1</sup> A. M. Glazer,<sup>2,3</sup> P. A. Thomas,<sup>3</sup> and J. M. Gregg<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Nanostructured Media, School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, BT7 1NN, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>Clarendon Laboratory, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom

(Received 19 February 2016; revised manuscript received 27 April 2016; published 12 July 2016)

In 1949, Forsbergh, Jr. reported spontaneous spatial ordering in the birefringence patterns seen in flux-grown BaTiO<sub>3</sub> crystals under the transmission polarized light microscope [Phys. Rev. **76**, 1187 (1949)]. Stunningly regular square-net arrays were often only found within a finite temperature window and could be induced on both heating and cooling, suggesting genuine thermodynamic stability. At the time, Forsbergh rationalized the patterns to have resulted from the impingement of ferroelastic domains, creating a complex tessellation of variously shaped domain packets. However, no direct evidence for the intricate microstructural arrangement proposed by Forsbergh has subsequently been found. Moreover, there are no robust thermodynamic arguments to explain the finite region of thermal stability, its occurrence just below the Curie temperature, and the apparent increase in entropy associated with the loss of the Forsbergh pattern on cooling. Despite decades of research on ferroelectrics, this ordering phenomenon and its thermodynamic origin have hence remained a mystery. In this paper, we reexamine the microstructure of flux-grown BaTiO<sub>3</sub> crystals, which show Forsbergh birefringence patterns. Given an absence of any obvious arrays of domain polyhedra or even regular shapes of domain packets, we suggest an alternative origin for the Forsbergh pattern in which sheets of orthogonally oriented ferroelastic stripe domains simply overlay one another. We show explicitly that the Forsbergh birefringence pattern occurs if the periodicity of the stripe domains is above a critical value. Moreover, by considering well-established semiempirical models, we show that the significant domain coarsening needed to generate the Forsbergh birefringence is fully expected in a finite window below the Curie temperature. We hence present a much more straightforward rationalization of the Forsbergh pattern than that originally proposed in which exotic thermodynamic arguments are unnecessary.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.94.024109

The spontaneous formation of periodic arrays, that go beyond ordered atomic arrangements in conventional crystals, is both visually arresting and scientifically compelling; hexagonal arrays of flux quanta (and associated supercurrent vortices) in type -I superconductors (Abrikosov vortex arrays) [1–3], topologically complex magnetic dipole skyrmion arrays [4–7], and static charge density wave structures [8,9], for example, all generate very strong research interest. The underlying physics responsible for the appearance of these ordered states is fascinating, and the potential discovery of unique properties, that novel periodic arrays might possess, demands thorough investigation.

In ferroelectrics, the formation of ordered arrays of dipole vortices has been predicted using atomistic simulations in nanoscale geometries [10,11]. Experimentally, individual flux-closure objects, ordered arrangements of flux-closed states into chains, and genuine dipole vortex arrays have been seen [12–20]. Examination of their dynamics of formation [21] and the functional properties of these systems are currently ongoing [22]. Despite this recent flurry of research activity, the suggestion that dipole groups in ferroelectrics might spontaneously form into periodic arrays is not new. Over 65 years ago Forsbergh [23], Matthias and von Hippel [24], and later Sato *et al.* [25], Deguchi and Nakamura [26], Nakamura *et al.* [27], and Lambert and co-workers [28] observed that domains in flux-grown BaTiO<sub>3</sub> generated striking square-net birefringence patterns, just below the Curie temperature ( $T_C$ ).

The phenomenon is illustrated in Fig. 1, which has been produced by an automatic polarizing microscope system (METRIPOL) [29]. This uses a rotating polarizer and a circular analyzer for which the intensity transmitted is given by

$$I = \frac{I_0}{2} [1 - 2 \sin(2\alpha - 2\phi) \sin \delta], \quad (1)$$

where  $I_0$  is the transmitted light after absorption through the specimen and  $\delta$  is the phase shift induced and is related to the birefringence by

$$\delta = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} (n_1 - n_2) d = \frac{2\pi \Delta n d}{\lambda}. \quad (2)$$

$\phi$  is the orientation of a major axis of the optical indicatrix;  $\alpha$  is the angle of rotation of the polarizer at any time;  $d$  is the sample thickness. Images are collected on a CCD typically at five or ten values of  $\alpha$ . By refining the intensity at each pixel in the image it is possible to separate out the three quantities  $I_0$ ,  $|\sin \delta|$ , and  $\phi$ , which are then used to create new false-color images. The images seen in Fig. 1 are from a film showing the change in orientation  $\phi$  and in  $|\sin \delta|$  with temperature (the complete videos can be downloaded from the Supplemental Material [30]).

In his original work, Forsbergh noted that the regular birefringent patterns only occurred when orthogonally oriented sets of 90° *a-c* ferroelectric-ferroelastic domains met. He supposed that the impingement of these sets induced the formation of a complex array of pyramids containing *a-a* stripe domains, pyramids of a single domain variant, and tetrahedra containing *a-c* stripe domains. We note that in a later work, Lambert *et al.* [28] suggested that a much less convoluted

\*Corresponding author: m.gregg@qub.ac.uk




FIG. 1. Examination of a flux-grown BaTiO<sub>3</sub> crystal, using the METRIPOL microscope, shows the spontaneous formation of the square-net pattern reported by Forsbergh [23], Matthias and von Hippel [24], and Lambert *et al.* [28]. On heating, the periodic array appears spontaneously at around 111 °C and disappears at the Curie temperature of approximately 120 °C (as determined from the collapse in birefringence). The images show the orientation  $\phi$  (top panels) and  $|\sin \delta|$  (bottom panels) distributions at three temperatures. The crystal thickness is on the order of 300  $\mu\text{m}$ .

domain pattern could form when two orthogonal  $a$ - $c$  packets intersected. However, in both approaches, square-net birefringence was directly linked to an ordered array of domain polyhedra, and in neither case was an explanation given for the periodic birefringence often only occurring within a distinct temperature range below  $T_C$ . We directly examined the domain patterns evident at room temperature near the surface of a thin flux-grown crystal, displaying a Forsbergh birefringence pattern with a period of  $\sim 50 \mu\text{m}$ , using piezoresponse force microscopy (PFM) and cross-sectional scanning transmission electron microscopy (STEM). As can be seen in Fig. 2, packets of 90° ferroelectric-ferroelastic domains are evident, but their distribution is irregular, and there is no indication of the kinds of well-defined polyhedral shapes suggested by Forsbergh. There are several interpretations for this finding: First, that the Forsbergh birefringence pattern is not related to tessellated




FIG. 2. Room-temperature lateral PFM imaging of the surface of a region of a flux-grown BaTiO<sub>3</sub> crystal in which the Forsbergh birefringence pattern is found [amplitude (a) and phase (b)] shows evidence for packets of domains. However, they are not regularly distributed and do not obviously correspond to the specific polyhedral shapes envisaged by Forsbergh [23]. For completeness, the inset shows the orientation of the cantilever axis, and the arrows indicate the directions of sensitivity to in-plane polarization components. The crystal surface is  $\{001\}_{\text{pseudocubic (pc)}}$ .




FIG. 3. As noted by Forsbergh [23], square-net birefringence patterns only occur where perpendicular sets of  $a$ - $c$  ferroelastic stripe domains meet as can be seen in (a). The  $a$ - $c$  domain contrast is indicated by line features parallel to the  $\langle 100 \rangle_{\text{pc}}$  directions (highlighted by fine blue arrows) consistent with lines of intersection of  $\{101\}_{\text{pc}}$  and  $\{011\}_{\text{pc}}$   $a$ - $c$  ferroelastic domain walls with the  $\{001\}_{\text{pc}}$  BaTiO<sub>3</sub> surface. The  $\{110\}_{\text{pc}}$   $a_1$ - $a_2$  domain walls would show stripe contrast features parallel to  $\langle 110 \rangle_{\text{pc}}$  directions on the same  $\{001\}_{\text{pc}}$  surface and so can be discounted as responsible for the contrast. Where the perpendicular sets of lines meet, a square feature in birefringence can be seen. This transmission optical image was taken approximately 2 °C below  $T_C$  (crystal temperature estimated as 118 °C) under crossed polars using a white-light source. Rather than consider hypothetical structures resulting from the impingement of  $a$ - $c$  domain packets as responsible for the Forsbergh birefringence, an alternative microstructure was considered theoretically, in which two slabs (labeled slab 1 and slab 2) of perpendicularly oriented  $a$ - $c$  domains are simply superposed (b). In this schematic, the orientation of polarization within each domain in the slabs is indicated by the coarse squat blue arrows.

polyhedra in the manner originally postulated; second, that the polyhedra are still present but buried beneath a skin layer with a different domain structure [31,32]; third, that the polyhedra only develop within the temperature range below  $T_C$  in which the Forsbergh pattern can be seen and are then destroyed on further cooling to room temperature. We attempted to examine the domains at elevated temperatures using PFM, but the signal-to-noise ratio became unfavorable. Nevertheless, we found no suggestion of the development of strongly ordered polyhedra at the surface just below  $T_C$ .

Given the complexity of the polyhedral microstructure suggested by Forsbergh and the lack of direct evidence for it, other potential origins for the birefringence square-net array need to be considered. Our optical observations confirmed the strong association between the coincidence of orthogonal sets of  $a$ - $c$  domains and the existence of the Forsbergh birefringence pattern [Fig. 3(a)]. However, we recognize that in transmission microscopy it is not always trivial to tell differences in the heights at which the imaged orthogonal domain sets occur. Therefore, rather than make conjectures about the manner in which  $a$ - $c$  domain sets might impinge [23,28], we here consider the birefringence that can be generated when two identical sheets of orthogonal  $a$ - $c$  domains are stacked on top of each other [Fig. 3(b)].

Below  $T_C$ , BaTiO<sub>3</sub> belongs to the space group  $P4mm$  and has an associated negative uniaxial optical indicatrix. When polarized light propagates perpendicular to a single slab of  $a$ - $c$



domains, the total retardation at each point is therefore given by the total thickness of the  $a$  domains locally perpendicular to the slab multiplied by the difference between the refractive indices parallel to the  $a$  and  $c$  axes. Perpendicularly polarized light components passing through the  $c$  domains are parallel to the optic axis and hence do not experience any relative retardation. If the domain periodicity ( $\omega$ ) is relatively fine in relation to the thickness of the slab ( $d$ ), then the overall retardation shows no spatial variation. However, if the domain period is sufficiently coarse that the  $\omega/d$  ratio exceeds a critical value of  $\sqrt{2}/2$ , then spatial modulation in retardation will start to become evident and will locally reach a maximum value of  $d(n_1 - n_3)$  (where  $n_1$  and  $n_3$  are the refractive indices along the  $a$  and  $c$  crystallographic directions in BaTiO<sub>3</sub>) once a second critical  $\omega/d$  ratio of  $\sqrt{2}$  is reached and exceeded [Fig. 4(a)].

For two identical, orthogonally oriented, slabs of  $a$ - $c$  domains, stacked one above the other, the overall retardation in two dimensions ( $x, y$ ) is given by

$$\Delta = (t_1 n_1 + t_2 n_3) - (t_1 n_3 + t_2 n_1), \quad (3)$$

where  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are the total thicknesses of  $a$  domains perpendicular to the slab surfaces in slabs 1 and 2, respectively, and are both functions of  $x$  and  $y$ . For the specific condition that  $\omega/d = \sqrt{2}$ , the retardation has been calculated explicitly, and the resultant form of the birefringence pattern is shown in Fig. 4(b). The similarity to the Forsbergh birefringence pattern is self-evident. Even if the two slabs are not of identical thickness, square-net birefringence patterns still develop as shown by the relative retardation pattern generated in Fig. 4(c). Here one slab is kept the same as that considered above (with a  $\omega/d$  ratio of  $\sqrt{2}$ ), whereas the thickness of the second overlaying slab has been increased by a factor of 1.5. The change in thickness was considered to also be associated with a change in the domain period (the domain period increases as the slab thickness increases), consistent with the Landau-Kittel scaling law discussed below. Although the pattern generated [Fig. 4(c)] is clearly different from that shown in Fig. 4(b), square-net features are still evident; indeed, there are areas in the images shown in Forsbergh's original article [23] that are strongly reminiscent of those in Fig. 4(c).

We should now address reasons why a birefringence pattern generated in this way might not be seen at room temperature but may be seen just below  $T_C$ : The Landau-Kittel scaling law for stripe domains generates the condition that under equilibrium,

$$\omega^2 = \frac{\gamma}{U} d = kd, \quad (4)$$

where  $\gamma$  is a domain-wall energy density term,  $U$  is an energy term associated with the order parameter within a domain being expressed uniformly (strain, polarization, or magnetization in the same sense, for example),  $k$  is equal to  $\gamma/U$ , and  $d$  is traditionally taken to be the crystal thickness. In previous research [33] on modern commercially grown BaTiO<sub>3</sub> crystals (top seeded), we have seen that when packets of domains are evident in the microstructure, the local dimensions of the packets define the thicknesses that determine the equilibrium periodicity of the stripe domains they contain; the overall crystal dimensions are not of primary importance.




FIG. 4. The optical retardation ( $\Delta$ ) through each slab of  $a$ - $c$  stripe domains will start to show spatial modulation when the ratio of domain periodicity ( $\omega$ ) to slab thickness ( $d$ ) is greater than or equal to  $\sqrt{2}/2$ . The amplitude of the optical retardation will locally reach a maximum when  $\omega/d \geq \sqrt{2}$ . The case where  $\omega/d = \sqrt{2}$  is considered schematically in (a) with a cross section of the  $a$ - $c$  stripe domains within a single slab (top panel) and the corresponding relative optical retardation ( $\Delta/\Delta_{\max}$ ) variation as a function of the ratio of distance  $x$  divided by domain period  $\omega$  [bottom panel in (a)]. When two such slabs of  $a$ - $c$  domains are placed one above the other and at  $90^\circ$  to each other, the spatial variation in retardation is such that the Forsbergh pattern is reproduced when viewed from above (b). Here, dark blue corresponds to the minimum relative retardation (0), and dark red corresponds to the maximum relative retardation (1) as indicated on the color scale. Even if the slabs are not of equal thickness, square-net birefringence still occurs: As an illustration, in (c) the thickness of one slab is kept the same as that considered in (a), but the thickness of the second slab is increased by a factor of 1.5.

Figure 5(a), for example, shows a STEM image of a BaTiO<sub>3</sub> nanocolumn (taken at room temperature), patterned from a bulk single crystal as described in Ref. [33]. The periodicity of the ferroelastic domains responsible for the stripe contrast within these columns can be seen to vary. It is approximately constant when the domain packet size is defined by the width of the column but decreases as the domain packet size is progressively constrained into the triangular points formed at junctions between packets of stripe domains. By taking measurements of the individual domain period of pairs of domains (an effective  $\omega$ ) as a function of the local packet width




FIG. 5. STEM image of a single crystal BaTiO<sub>3</sub> pillar (beam parallel to the  $\langle 100 \rangle_{pc}$  direction), similar to those published by Schilling *et al.* in Ref. [33] and fabricated by focused ion-beam (FIB) patterning in the same manner as described in Ref. [33] (a); the image illustrates the way in which ferroelastic domain periodicity depends on the local dimensions of the domain packet containing the stripe domains: Note how the domain periodicity decreases as the packet dimensions become progressively more constrained towards the points of the triangles in individual domain packets. For this image, the local domain period ( $\omega$ ) has been examined as a function of the local domain packet width ( $d$ ), and the Landau-Kittel scaling relationship was found to hold reasonably well (b). By considering the way in which  $\omega/d$  varies with temperature, using Eq. (6) and literature values for Young's modulus, spontaneous strain, and domain wall energy (c), it can be seen that the  $\omega/d$  ratio in slabs of  $a$ - $c$  stripe domains only exceeds the two critical values of  $\sqrt{2}/2$  and  $\sqrt{2}$  in a narrow region just below  $T_C$ . The width of this region grows as the slab thickness decreases. However it is much narrower than that observed experimentally in Fig. 1, for example. Recalculating the expected  $\omega/d$  values using measurements by Walker *et al.* in Ref. [41] for the specific crystals studied herein (d), shows that the sudden collapse in spontaneous strain evident from x-ray diffraction causes a dramatic increase in the window of stability of the Forsbergh patterns (visible when the  $\omega/d$  ratio exceeds  $\sqrt{2}/2$ ).

at each point (an effective dimension  $d$ ), reasonable adherence to Landau-Kittel scaling can be seen [Fig. 5(b)]. Thus, in our model,  $d$  is taken to refer to the thickness of each of the two slabs of  $a$ - $c$  stripe domains and not the overall thickness of the crystal. As mentioned above, for contrast associated with the Forsbergh birefringence pattern to even begin to emerge,  $\omega/d \geq \sqrt{2}/2$ . Using Eq. (4), this condition can be reexpressed in terms of  $d$  only as follows:

$$\frac{\omega^2}{d^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and hence} \quad \frac{k}{d} \geq \frac{1}{2} \\ \therefore d \leq 2k. \quad (5)$$

For thin free-standing BaTiO<sub>3</sub> sheets cut from recently grown commercial single crystals (top seeded), Schilling *et al.* have already mapped the periodicity of 90° stripe domains as a function of thickness [34] and confirmed adherence to Landau-Kittel scaling with  $k \sim 45$  nm. Similar data from flux-grown samples are unfortunately not available. However, if similar parameters transfer to flux-grown BaTiO<sub>3</sub>, this implies that the effective thickness of individual  $a$ - $c$  slabs would have to be below  $\sim 100$  nm for stripe domains to be sufficiently coarse (relative to the slab thickness) for a periodic birefringent pattern to even begin to emerge under equilibrium conditions at room temperature. This scale of microstructure may be too fine to occur in most circumstances.

However, using temperature-variable PFM on the same batch of crystals used in the work of Schilling *et al.* [34], McGilly *et al.* [35] have already directly observed that ferroelastic stripe domains in BaTiO<sub>3</sub> significantly coarsen within a few degrees of  $T_C$ . In addition, they have rationalized the coarsening phenomenon by adapting a number of established semiempirical models to obtain the expression,

$$\omega(T) = c \left[ \frac{\gamma(T)d}{E(T)s(T)^2} \right]^{1/2}, \quad (6)$$

where the domain period ( $\omega$ ) is now a function of temperature ( $T$ ) as is the domain-wall energy density ( $\gamma$ ), Young's modulus ( $E$ ), and spontaneous strain ( $s$ );  $c$  is a temperature-independent constant. The form of this expression is valid for any ferroelectric system. Using the same literature sources [36–38] for  $\gamma(T)$ ,  $E(T)$ , and  $s(T)$  as used by McGilly *et al.* [35], we have plotted the behavior of  $\omega/d$  as a function of temperature implied by Eq. (6) in Fig. 5(c). Importantly, studies [36,38] involve either direct measurements on flux-grown crystals or the use of data taken from prior measurements on flux-grown crystals and so are particularly relevant for this discussion. Reference [37] involves the study of ceramic BaTiO<sub>3</sub>, but when the behavior of Young's modulus around and below  $T_C$  taken from Ref. [37] is extrapolated to room temperature, it approximates well to the values determined at room temperature specifically for flux-grown single crystals [39,40]. The form of the function shown in Fig. 5(c) makes it clear that the two critical values associated with observable periodic birefringence development should only occur close to  $T_C$ . It should be noted that, as the dimensions of the domain packets decrease, the thermal stability of the Forsbergh pattern increases. In principle, this nicely rationalizes the existence of the narrow temperature window just below  $T_C$  in which the Forsbergh birefringence is observed.

Unfortunately, direct use of data obtained, interpolated, and extrapolated from Refs. [36–38] predicts a temperature window which is dramatically narrower than that associated with the images in Fig. 1, where stable Forsbergh patterns exist between 111 °C and the Curie temperature (measured through birefringence to be  $\sim 120$  °C). This would be equivalent to the onset of square-net birefringence at  $T/T_C$  of  $\sim 0.98$  compared to the  $\sim 0.9975$  associated with Fig. 5(c). We note, however, that the behavior of the spontaneous strain, measured using x-ray diffraction by Walker *et al.* [41], on the same crystals as those illustrated in Fig. 1, shows a dramatic collapse at 111 °C. Equation (6) shows that the domain periodicity is strongly

dependent on spontaneous strain and so the temperature dependence of  $\omega/d$  was recalculated using the Walker *et al.* [41] data, as opposed to that from Megaw [38]. As can be seen in Fig. 5(d), this dramatically expands the thermal window in which Forsbergh patterns should be visible: in this case to  $T/T_C \sim 0.98$  for slab thicknesses around  $50\ \mu\text{m}$ . This  $T/T_C$  value matches experiment extremely well, as the sharp anomaly in  $\omega/d$  seen in Fig. 5(d) is a direct result of the collapse in spontaneous strain observed. The slab thickness of  $50\ \mu\text{m}$  implies an overall crystal thickness of  $100\ \mu\text{m}$ , which is somewhat thinner than the crystals examined. However, in calculating the values of  $\omega/d$  in Fig. 5(d), we have assumed that the strain measured by Walker *et al.* [41] between  $111^\circ\text{C}$  and  $120^\circ\text{C}$  is entirely due to the spontaneous strain in the system. This is erroneous as Walker *et al.* [41] explicitly state that most of this observed strain within this temperature window is not due to spontaneous strain but is rather residual strain in the crystal; our calculated values of  $\omega/d$  for each slab thickness are therefore underestimated in the region of  $0.98 < T/T_C < 1$ . Unfortunately, Walker *et al.* [41] could not explicitly determine the relative contribution of the spontaneous strain in this temperature window, and so we are forced to accept that the crystal thickness of  $100\ \mu\text{m}$  is a lower limit estimate and that the actual maximum thickness, at which Forsbergh patterns may be seen, should be significantly higher.

To summarize, we have reevaluated the potential origins for the spontaneously occurring self-ordered pattern of birefringence that has been known to occur in flux-grown  $\text{BaTiO}_3$  crystals for over 65 years. Despite the obvious complexity of the original explanation, suggested by Forsbergh [23], few alternative models have been forthcoming to date. Rather, it has been widely accepted for decades that transient complex

arrays of tessellating polyhedra spontaneously form just below  $T_C$  because of the impingement of orthogonal  $a$ - $c$  domain sets and then disappear on further cooling. Since microstructural investigations of regions of crystal in which Forsbergh birefringence occurs do not show direct evidence for highly ordered arrangements of specific domain polyhedra, an alternative and simpler explanation has been considered in which orthogonally oriented slabs of  $a$ - $c$  domains are stacked one above the other. We have shown that this arrangement can readily generate the Forsbergh [23] birefringence pattern, provided the periodicity of the  $a$ - $c$  domains is sufficiently coarse in relation to the thickness of the slabs. At room temperature and under the equilibrium scaling laws developed by Kittel and by Landau and Lifshitz, Forsbergh birefringence should only be evident if the slabs are thinner than  $\sim 100\ \text{nm}$ . However, on heating, we show that this condition is dramatically relaxed and, close to  $T_C$ , domain coarsening caused by reductions in spontaneous strain should result in a distinct window in which the Forsbergh birefringence array would be observed. The size of this thermal window increases dramatically when the spontaneous strain collapse measured by Walker *et al.* [41] is explicitly considered. The simplicity of the required microstructure and the associated straightforward explanation for a region of thermal stability for the square-net birefringence below  $T_C$  make our stacked slab model an attractive alternative explanation to that given by Forsbergh [23].

A.S., J.M.G., R.G.P.McQ., and A.K. acknowledge the support of the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) through Contracts No. EP/F004869/1 and No. EP/N018389/1.

- 
- [1] H. F. Hess, R. B. Robinson, R. C. Dynes, J. M. Valles, Jr., and J. V. Waszczak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 214 (1989).
  - [2] U. Essmann and H. Trauble, *Phys. Lett. A* **24**, 526 (1967).
  - [3] P. L. Gammel, D. J. Bishop, G. J. Dolan, J. R. Kwo, C. A. Murray, L. F. Schneemeyer, and J. V. Waszczak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2592 (1987).
  - [4] S. Mühlbauer, B. Binz, F. Jonietz, C. Pfleiderer, A. Rosch, A. Neubauer, R. Georgii, and P. Böni, *Science* **323**, 915 (2009).
  - [5] X. Z. Yu, Y. Onose, N. Kanazawa, J. H. Park, J. H. Han, Y. Matsui, N. Nagaosa, and Y. Tokura, *Nature (London)* **465**, 901 (2010).
  - [6] C. Pfleiderer, *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 673 (2011).
  - [7] A. Neubauer, C. Pfleiderer, B. Binz, A. Rosch, R. Ritz, P. G. Niklowitz, and P. Boni, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 186602 (2009).
  - [8] A. Soumyanarayanan, M. M. Yee, Y. He, J. van Wezel, D. J. Rahn, K. Rossnagel, E. W. Hudson, M. R. Norman, and J. E. Hoffman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **110**, 1623 (2013).
  - [9] K. C. Rahnejat, C. A. Howard, N. E. Shuttlesworth, S. R. Schofield, K. Iwaya, C. F. Hirjibehedin, C. Renner, G. Aeppli, and M. Ellerby, *Nat. Commun.* **2**, 558 (2011).
  - [10] I. I. Naumov, L. Bellaiche, and H. Fu, *Nature (London)* **432**, 737 (2004).
  - [11] H. Fu and L. Bellaiche, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 257601 (2003).
  - [12] Y. Ivry, D. P. Chu, J. F. Scott, and C. Durkan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 207602 (2010).
  - [13] L. J. McGilly and J. M. Gregg, *Nano Lett.* **11**, 4490 (2011).
  - [14] R. G. P. McQuaid, L. J. McGilly, P. Sharma, A. Gruverman, and J. M. Gregg, *Nat. Commun.* **2**, 404 (2011).
  - [15] N. Balke, S. Choudhury, S. Jesse, M. Huijben, Y. H. Chu, A. P. Baddorf, L. Q. Chen, R. Ramesh, and S. V. Kalinin, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **4**, 868 (2009).
  - [16] R. K. Vasudevan, Y.-C. Chen, H.-H. Tai, N. Balke, P. Wu, S. Bhattacharya, L. Q. Chen, Y.-H. Chu, I.-N. Lin, S. V. Kalinin, and V. Nagarajan, *ACS Nano* **5**, 879 (2011).
  - [17] L. J. McGilly, A. Schilling, and J. M. Gregg, *Nano Lett.* **10**, 4200 (2010).
  - [18] L.-W. Chang, V. Nagarajan, J. F. Scott, and J. M. Gregg, *Nano Lett.* **13**, 2553 (2013).
  - [19] Y. L. Tang, Y. L. Zhu, X. L. Ma, A. Y. Borisevich, A. N. Morozovska, E. A. Eliseev, W. Y. Wang, Y. J. Wang, Y. B. Xu, Z. D. Zhang, and S. J. Pennycook, *Science* **348**, 547 (2015).
  - [20] A. K. Yadav, C. T. Nelson, S. L. Hsu, Z. Hong, J. D. Clarkson, C. M. Schlepütz, A. R. Damodaran, P. Shafer, E. Arenholz, L. R. Dedon, D. Chen, A. Vishwanath, A. M. Minor, L. Q. Chen, J. F. Scott, L. W. Martin, and R. Ramesh, *Nature (London)* **530**, 198 (2016).

- [21] R. G. P. McQuaid, A. Gruverman, J. F. Scott, and J. M. Gregg, *Nano Lett.* **14**, 4230 (2014).
- [22] N. Balke, B. Winchester, W. Ren, Y. H. Chu, A. N. Morozovska, E. A. Eliseev, M. Huijben, R. K. Vasudevan, P. Maksymovych, J. Britson, S. Jesse, I. Kornev, R. Ramesh, L. Bellaiche, L. Q. Chen, and S. V. Kalinin, *Nat. Phys.* **8**, 81 (2012).
- [23] P. W. Forsbergh, Jr., *Phys. Rev.* **76**, 1187 (1949).
- [24] B. Matthias and A. von Hippel, *Phys. Rev.* **73**, 1378 (1948).
- [25] H. Sato, E. Nakamura, and H. Motegi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **43**, 1811 (1977).
- [26] K. Deguchi and E. Nakamura, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **30**, 301 (1971).
- [27] E. Nakamura, H. Sato, and H. Motegi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **47**, 1567 (1979).
- [28] M. Lambert, A. M. Quittet, C. Taupin, and A. Guinier, *J. Phys. (France)* **25**, 345 (1964).
- [29] A. M. Glazer, J. G. Lewis, and W. Kaminsky, *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **452**, 2751 (1996).
- [30] See Supplemental Material at <http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevB.94.024109> for a film showing the change in indicatrix orientation  $\phi$  and in  $|\sin \delta|$  with temperature.
- [31] X. Marti, P. Ferrer, J. Herrero-Albillos, J. Narvaez, V. Holy, N. Barrett, M. Alexe, and G. Catalan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 236101 (2011).
- [32] N. Domingo, N. Bagues, J. Santiso, and G. Catalan, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 094111 (2015).
- [33] A. Schilling, R. M. Bowman, G. Catalan, J. F. Scott, and J. M. Gregg, *Nano Lett.* **7**, 3787 (2007); A. Schilling, R. M. Bowman, J. M. Gregg, G. Catalan, and J. F. Scott, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **89**, 212902 (2006).
- [34] A. Schilling, T. B. Adams, R. M. Bowman, J. M. Gregg, G. Catalan, and J. F. Scott, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 024115 (2006).
- [35] L. J. McGilly, T. L. Burnett, A. Schilling, M. G. Cain, and J. M. Gregg, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 054113 (2012).
- [36] P. Marton, I. Rychetsky, and J. Hlinka, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 144125 (2010).
- [37] L. Dong, D. S. Stone, and R. S. Lakes, *Philos. Mag. Lett.* **90**, 23 (2010).
- [38] H. D. Megaw, *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **189**, 261 (1947).
- [39] W. P. Mason, *Phys. Rev.* **74**, 1134 (1948).
- [40] W. J. Merz, *Phys. Rev.* **78**, 52 (1950).
- [41] D. Walker, A. M. Glazer, S. Gorfman, J. Baruchel, P. Pernot, R. T. Kluender, F. Masiello, C. DeVreugd, and P. A. Thomas, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 024110 (2016).